ILLINOIS ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

ODI EVA	LUAITON REPORT	- IEPA 51	IE INVENTOR	1 NO. <u>2</u> 1	6 1 8 2 3	L Se
SANGAM	COU_COU	nty	Region	C	Date	1-17-80
SPRINGE	IELD /B	WERKET	r # 2 II	spector	L A B	Time
	V=	N.		T		
Samples	Yes	NO				
Photos	Yes	No		Weather		
IEPA Status _	OPERATI	NG				
Location of F	Facility <u>Sw</u>	114 , Su	114 5	ECT 9	NW14, K	w114,
Sect 12	T. 15 N.	, R.5	<u>w.</u>			
Evaluation Do	one By: _	Fi	le Review			
		On	Site Visi	t		
	-	0t				
	_					
Dates/Times		1				
1.) 29	July 1980	JAJ				
2.)						
3.)						
4.)						
5.)						
Comments: _	SITE FAIL	S CRI	TERIA 1	FOR OG	OURFACE L	JATER -
40a. L	EACHATE F	FLOWS 3	TUTO D	RAINAGE	DITCH TO	EAST
THEN TH	RU CEMEN	T PIPE	INTO	STREAM	RUNNING	P WEST
to Enst	BISECTIN	& SITE	•			



EVALUATION

1.)	Is open burning of solid wastes practiced at the facility? (If yes continue to 2, if no why, complies)	No
2.)	PAST INSPECTION REPORTS REVERL NO SICH PRACTICE Are residential, commercial, institutional, or industrial solid wastes open bured at the facility? (If yes, which & how documented; if nocontinued to 3)	1/0
3.)	Are landclearing debris, diseased trees, debris from emergency clean up operations, silvicultural and agricultural wastes, or odance burned at the facility? (If yes-which & how documented; if no-complies)	<u> NO</u>
4.)	Does the facility control air emissions in accordance with the State Implementation Plan approved or promulgated by the administrator pursuant to Section 110 of the Clean Air Act? (If yes-how, complies)	NIA
1.)	Is methane generated? (If yes-how; if no-why not, complies)	YES
2.)	SITE ACCEPTS PUTRESCIBLE WASTE Is methane prevented from migrating beyond the property boundary and accumulating in facility structures? (If yes-how, complies; if no continue to 3)	
3.)	GAS VENTS INSTALLED ALONG REILLY CONSTRUCTION CO. PROPER Ranking of facilities based on potential for methane hazard at the time of the inventory. (Ratings are H-M-L and denote why)	M A
4.)	CHECK VENTING: GAS LEYELS IN ON-SITE BUILDINGS	
5.)	Does the facility have the potential for fire occurrence? (If yes -continue to 6; if no-why, complies)	YES
6.)	SITE ACCEPTS COMBUSTIBLE WASTE Does the facility comply with Section 257.3-7 of the air criterion? (If yes- continue to 7; if no continue to 7)	Yes

6.)	Does the facility cause non-point source polluting of the waters of the U.S. that violates applicable legal requirements implementing an area wide or statewide water quality management plan that has been developed and approved by the administrator under Section 208 of the Clean Water Act as amended? (If yes-how; if no-why not, complies)	NO
	NO MANDFILL CRITERIA	
1.)	GROUND WATER Does ground water contain more than 10,000 TDS and is it not being used as a human drinking water source? (If yes-which, complies; if no-which, continue to 2)	No
2.)	Rank facility according to its contamination potential. (L-M-H)(Justify) Landfill Surface Impoundment Land Spreading Facility	<u>L</u>
3.)	15GS - UNDISTURBED MATERIAL UNDER PIT-PERM. 10 ⁻⁴ . GROWNER POLLUTIEN POTENTIAL LCW. CLAY + SHALE UND Has an underground drinking water source been contaminated by the facility beyond the solid waste or alternate boundary? (If yes-how do you know; if no-why, complies)	HP DERLIE
1.)	ENDANGERED SPECIES Is the facility within a critical habitat or the portion of the range when endangered or threatened for an endangered or threatened species as listed pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in 50 CFR Part 17? (If yes-continue to 2; if no-complies)	
2.)	Has there been an assessment which enables the determination that the facility neither results in the destruction or adverse modification of the critical habitat of endangered or threatened species, nor causes or contributes to the taking of an endangered or threatened species of plants fish, or wildlife? (If yes-what & how, complies; if no-continue to 3)	
3.)	Does the facility result in the destruction or adverse modification of a critical habitat? (How) (If no-complies)	No

2.)	Is there an operating plan which demonstrated how the crop is to be distributed to preclude ingestion by humans and provides safeguards to prevent possible health hazards resulting from alternative future uses of the land? (If yes-document, continue to 3; if no-go to 5)	
3.	Does a notice appear in the land records notifying any future owners that the property has received solid waste at high cadmium application rates and that food chain crops should not be grown due to a possible health hazard? (If yes-where; continue to 4)	
4.)	Is the solid waste and soil mixture at pH 6.5 or greater at the time of solid waste application or at the time the crop is planted, whichever occurs later? (What is the pH; if no-continue to 5)	
5.)	Is the background soil pH greater than 6.5 or are there adequate safe- guards to assure that the soil pH will be maintained at 6.5 or higher whenever food chain crops are grown? (If yes-how documented; if no-go to 7)	
6.)	Does the soil cadmium concentration exceed 5 kg/ha with a CEC of less than 5, or 10 kg/ha with a CEC of 5 to 15, or 20 kg/ha with a CEC greater than 15? (If yes-what is level; if no-go to 8)	
7.)	Has the cumulative application of cadmium exceed 5 kg/ha? (What; continue to 8)	
8.)	Is the annual application rate of cadmium in excess of 2 kg/ha? (What is rate; continue to 9)	
9.)	If waste is applied to land used for the production of tobacco, leafy vegetables, or root crops for human consumption, is the cadmium loading rate less than 0.5 kg/ha/yr? (If yes-what is crop & rate; continue to 10)	
10.)	Is the cadmium concentration in the waste less than 2 kg/ha? (What is level; continue to 11)	1
11.)	Is the pH of the soil/waste mixture 6.5 or greater at the time of application? (What is pH; continue to 12)	_
		ł

- LPC 16782516 DATE: March 1978 ngfield / Buerkett #2 TIME: ASH ST. Construction BuerkeH GAS KN) Annex PIT A PIT B CILIFD FILLED Springfield Sanitary District R Existing Site PITC